

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1-12 and 17-21 are currently pending. Claims 13-15 were previously canceled. Claim 16 was previously withdrawn. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 12, and 17 have been amended. No new matter is added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-10, 17, 18, 20, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayaghi et al. (USP 6,950,852) in view of Ohkado et al. (US 2001/0016873). Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ohkado et al. in view of Kobayaghi et al. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kobayaghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. further in view of Kim et al. (US 2003/0105819). However, for at least the reasons presented herein, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been traversed and requests that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn.

As currently amended, claim 1 requires, among other things,

- 1) “a server provided with a means to directly transmit a detecting script ...and an updating script ...and a means to directly transmit update information...such information being directly sent from a prescribed terminal, to another terminal;” and
- 2) “terminals...to receive the detecting script and the updating script which are directly sent from said server... and to directly transmit the resultant update information to said server;”

As currently amended, Claim 7 requires, among other things,

- 1) “a means to receive a detecting script... an updating script... and update information ... all of these scripts being directly sent from a server;” and
- 2) “a means to... transmit the resultant update information directly to said server;”

As currently amended, Claim 11 requires, among other things,

- 1) “means to directly transmit to a terminal a detecting script... and an updating script;” and

- 2) “means to first directly transmit said retrieved update information and then directly transmit said retrieved part update information to said another terminal.”

As currently amended, Claim 17 requires, among other things,

- 1) “server directly transmitting to the first terminal a detecting script... and directly transmitting to said second terminal an updating script;” and
- 2) “first terminal...generating and directly transmitting to said server update information;” and
- 3) “server directly transmitting the update information sent from the first terminal to the second terminal;”

In various embodiments, the invention includes a server which directly transmits the detecting and updating scripts to the terminals that display the web page and directly receives update information from the terminals. Therefore, modifying the scripts of the web pages, which permits the system to complete real-time web sharing, is performed in the communicating terminals. The server directly transmits the detecting and updating scripts between the terminals but does not modify the scripts of the shared web pages.

In contrast, the system of Kobayaghi et al. discloses a “collaboration server” which includes a “CachinManager” that accumulates pages sent from a web server and modifies the pages with a Page Manager, where the modified page is then sent to a sharing computer. See Kobayaghi et al. at col. 2, lines 2-11, 33-40, col. 8, lines 51-54. The process of embedding a Page Manager into the web pages in Kobayaghi et al. is performed in the collaboration server, as opposed to the invention in claims 1, 7, 11, and 17 which directly transmits detecting and updating scripts to the terminals via a server.

The system of Ohkado et al. employs a similar mechanism as that of Kobayaghi et al., using cache manager 115, which is part of collaboration server 110, to embed applets and scripts into web pages outside of the customer’s browser 130. See Ohkado et al. at para. 0113, 0116, Fig. 3. “The collaboration server 110 modifies an html including a BODY tag to embed an applet and a script for detecting the structure of the html and its change.” See Ohkado et al. at para. 0098, Fig. 2. As presented, Ohkado et al. also teaches a system which modifies the web

pages on the collaboration server, as opposed to the invention in claims 1, 7, 11, and 17 which directly transmits detecting and updating scripts to the terminals via a server.

Thus, the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. (cited against claims 1-10, 17, 18, 20, and 21) or the combination of Ohkado et al. in view of Kobayghi et al. (cited against claims 11 and 12) does not teach or suggest a system which includes, among other elements, “a server provided with a means to directly transmit a detecting script ... and an updating script” to a terminal, “all of these scripts being directly sent from a server,” or “means to first directly transmit... update information and then directly transmit... update information,” or “server directly transmitting the update information sent from the first terminal to the second terminal,” as in claims 1, 7, 11, and 17. Instead, the combination of these references teaches a system that includes a collaboration server that accumulates web pages from a first web server, modifies the web pages with scripts, saves the web pages on a second web server that is part of the collaboration server and is separate from the first web server that initially produced the pages, and sends the modified web pages from the server to another machine to be displayed on its browser.

Since the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. or the combination of Ohkado et al. in view of Kobayghi et al. does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1, 7, 11, or 17, these claims are not obvious in view of these combinations and are thus allowable. For at least this reason and because each recites additional patentable subject matter, the remaining claims 2-6, 8-10, 12, and 18, 20, and 21 are allowable because each depends from an allowable independent claim.

Finally, as Kim et al. fails to supply the deficiencies of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al., the combination of Kobayghi et al. in view of Ohkado et al. further in view of Kim et al. fails to teach all of the elements of claim 19 and thus does not render claim 19 obvious.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks presented herein, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. The Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned at the phone number below should any issues remain with respect to the application.

No other fees are believed due in connection with this submission. However, if additional fees are owed, please charge Deposit Account 50-1965.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP

By: /thomas j. keating/
Thomas J. Keating, Reg. No. 59,110
Tel.: 608-257-3501

Dated: October 30, 2009

Docket: 202064-9001 US00

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
Two Prudential Plaza
180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000
Chicago, Illinois 60601
312.222.0800